A HELLENISTIC ANTHOLOGY

SELECTED AND EDITED BY

NEIL HOPKINSON

Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

First published 1988
Reprinted 1990, 1994, 1996, 1999

Printed in Great Britain at the
Athenæum Press Ltd, Gateshead, Tyne & Wear

British Library cataloguing in publication data

Hellenistic anthology. – (Cambridge Greek
and Latin classics).
1. Greek poetry
I. Hopkinson, N. II. Cambridge Greek and
Latin classics
881'.01'08 PA3431

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data

A Hellenistic anthology.
(Cambridge Greek and Latin classics)
Includes indexes.
1. Greek literature, Hellenistic. I. Hopkinson, N.
II. Series.
PA3423.Z5H45 1987 880'.01'09 97–6359

ISBN 0 521 30696 5 hardcovers
ISBN 0 521 31425 9 paperback

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Ἆ μάκαρ, ὅστις ἦν κεῖνον χρόνον ἵδρις ἀοιδῆς,
Μουσάων θεράπων, ὅτ' ἀκήρατος ἦν ἔτι λειμών·
νῦν δ' ὅτε πάντα δέδασται, ἔχουσι δὲ πείρατα τέχναι,
ὕστατοι ὥστε δρόμου καταλειπόμεθ', οὐδέ πηι ἔστι
πάντηι παπταίνοντα νεοζυγὲς ἅρμα πελάσσαι.

(*SH* 317)

Blessed indeed the man who was skilled in song in those days, a 'servant of the Muses' when the meadow was still undefiled! Now, when everything has been portioned out and the arts have reached their limits, we are left behind in the race, and one looks everywhere in vain for a place to drive one's newly yoked chariot.

These are the gloomy words of Choerilus of Samos, an epic poet writing in the late fifth century B.C. Earlier writers have explored every avenue, have excelled in every type of poetry. What way is still untravelled by the chariot of song? Choerilus' response to this problem was an epic poem which dealt, unusually, with a recent historical subject – the Persian Wars.

More than a century later Callimachus, most influential of all the Hellenistic poets, employs similar imagery in a famous polemical defence of his own approach to poetry. He rejects warlike themes and says that Apollo advised him not to use the well worn high-road, but to drive his chariot along untrodden by-ways (*1–40*).

The texts collected in this book illustrate some of the highly diverse 'by-ways' followed by Hellenistic poets as they selected and combined elements from earlier writers to create a new, sophisticated type of poetry far different in tone and technique from anything that had gone before.

1. THE BACKGROUND[1]

By the middle of the fourth century B.C. many of the old Greek city-states had become weakened by decades of almost continuous warfare, and the centre of power shifted to wealthy Macedonia. Philip II of Macedon allied Greece with his own kingdom; his son Alexander conquered Egypt, Syria, Persia and Asia as far east as the Indus. At Alexander's death in 323 the empire was divided amongst his generals, and bitter wars ensued. By about 275 four main dynastic kingdoms had emerged:

(1) Macedon and Greece (capital Pella), ruled by the Antigonids, descendants of Antigonus 'Monophthalmus'.
(2) Asia (capital Antioch), ruled by the Seleucids, descendants of Alexander's general Seleucus.
(3) Asia Minor (capital Pergamum), which between 283 and 240 gradually expanded within Seleucid territory; ruled by the Attalids, descendants of Philaenetus (son of Attalus), who had administered Pergamum for Seleucus.
(4) Egypt (capital Alexandria), ruled by the Ptolemies, descendants of Ptolemy (son of Lagus), a Macedonian general of Alexander.

In Greece and Asia Minor the old city-states maintained their democratic machinery and had some local autonomy; but ultimate power resided with the kings, who lived in splendour at their courts in Pella, Pergamum, Antioch and Alexandria, surrounded by official 'friends' and advisers and by large administrative staffs.

Rivalling the Athenian example of state patronage for the arts the Hellenistic monarchs established their capital cities as centres of culture equipped with libraries, facilities for scientific inquiry and schools of art and philosophy, the latter modelled on the Athenian Peripatos and Academy. The prospect of royal patronage attracted artists and men of learning from all over the Greek world. These international centres promoted the exchange of ideas between scholars and artists living in close proximity, and resulted in an intellectual culture more unified than that which had existed in the πόλις-orientated Greece of earlier times. The Greek language, too, became more uniform: a common

[1] See further *The Cambridge Ancient History* VII² 1, eds. F. W. Walbank & A. E. Astin (Cambridge, 1984), W. W. Tarn & G. T. Griffith, *Hellenistic civilisation* (3rd edn, London, 1952).

speech, the κοινή, gradually replaced the ancient dialects. (The stylized and artificial *literary* dialects, which had long since lost their geographical and ethnic associations and had become linked with particular types of poetry, continued to be used by Hellenistic poets.)

During the second and first centuries B.C. the monarchies gradually came under Roman domination. Egypt retained a token independence until the death of Cleopatra in 30 B.C. The deaths of Alexander and Cleopatra are taken conventionally to mark the limits of the Hellenistic period (323–30 B.C.). Pergamum, Antioch and Alexandria continued as cultural centres until well into the Christian era.

2. ALEXANDRIA[2]

i. The social and religious background

Alexandria, situated on the western edge of the Nile delta, was founded by Alexander in about 331, shortly after his conquest of Egypt; his main aim was probably to provide easy sea communication with Europe. In 323 Ptolemy set up residence in the town and made it the seat of government; in 305 he declared himself king.

Alexandria had been founded from nothing, and all its Greek-speaking inhabitants were of immigrant stock. In addition there was a large population of Jews, Syrians, slaves and native Egyptians: it has been estimated that in the province as a whole the Egyptians numbered about seven million, the Greeks only about one hundred thousand. For those Greeks who were citizens the trappings of democracy were established, but Ptolemy kept control of affairs through his own officials.

The first four Ptolemies were:

(1) Ptolemy I 'Soter' (a cult title often given to great benefactors), d. 283, who married his step-sister Berenice (I).
(2) Ptolemy II 'Philadelphus' (so called because he married his sister Arsinoe), son of Soter and Berenice, 283–246.
(3) Ptolemy III 'Euergetes' (='benefactor'), son of Philadelphus and Arsinoe, 246–221; he married Berenice (II) daughter of Magas, king of Cyrene.
(4) Ptolemy IV 'Philopator', 221–204, son of Euergetes and Berenice.

[2] See further Fraser *passim*, Pfeiffer, *HCS* 87–279, L. D. Reynolds & N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and scholars* (3rd edn, Oxford, 1991) 1–18, *CHCL* I 16–36.

It was not unusual in Greece for divine honours to be paid to a great benefactor after his death. Hellenistic monarchs went a step further and instituted dynastic cults and ruler-cults as a focus for the loyalty and patriotism of their Greek citizens. Soter set up a cult of Alexander, whose body was buried in the city. A full dynastic cult was introduced by Philadelphus; it was administered by a hierarchy of provincial priests who were official 'friends' of the king. Philadelphus and his sister-wife Arsinoe, whose incestuous marriage in imitation of Egyptian royal practice had at first scandalized the Greeks in Egypt, were worshipped during their lifetimes as Θεοὶ Ἀδελφοί;[3] Arsinoe was in addition identified with Aphrodite[4] and with Isis, and after her death in 270 she was given a separate cult with its own priesthood. These cults, together with those of the traditional Olympian gods (especially of Dionysus, from whom the Ptolemies claimed descent), provided opportunity for public show as well as for ruler-workship. In 279 Philadelphus founded the Πτολεμαιεῖα, a festival with competitions in gymnastics, music, etc., modelled on the Olympic Games. A long fragment of the historian Callixinus of Rhodes (*FGH* 627 F 1–2) describes a spectacular πομπή or procession, an amazing pageant of the colourful and the exotic, which took place through the streets of Alexandria in honour of Dionysus.[5] In the second *Idyll* of Theocritus (*574–738*) Simaetha describes how she fell in love whilst on her way to watch a procession of this sort.

Other deities, such as the Egyptian Isis and Osiris, and the newly introduced Sarapis, played a large part in religious life but left very little trace in Alexandrian poetry, which concerned itself with treating, often in novel ways, the gods familiar from earlier Greek literature.

Native Egyptians worshipped the Ptolemies as Pharaohs. It was in imitation of Pharaonic tradition that Philadelphus married his sister.

ii. Alexandria as cultural centre

The Ptolemies were themselves learned and cultured men. Soter composed a history of Alexander's campaigns; Philadelphus was interested in science; Euergetes published a narrative of his own entry

[3] Cf. *1400* & n.

[4] See on *1646–57*.

[5] See E. E. Rice, *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphos* (Oxford, 1983).

into Antioch; Philopator wrote a tragedy called *Adonis* and founded a temple to Homer. Throughout the third century conditions were favourable to literature and learning. Patronage was nothing new: the Greek tyrants of the sixth and fifth centuries had earned praise from poets for their beneficence. But the Hellenistic approach was quite different. Under the early Ptolemies permanent conditions were established in Alexandria for academic study totally at the royal expense. Facilities included an observatory, a school of anatomy and a zoo; but the most famous Alexandrian institution was the Μουσεῖον, literally 'shrine of the Muses', founded by Soter probably with advice from Demetrius of Phalerum, an expelled governor of Athens, pupil of Aristotle and author of philosophical works. The Museum was built close to the royal palace area. For those fortunate enough to secure royal patronage it provided free meals and accommodation and the opportunity to pursue research in most branches of learning. Given the Peripatetic (Aristotelian) influence on its foundation, it is hardly surprising that scientific as well as artistic and literary inquiries were carried on there. In overall charge was a ἱερεύς of the Muses or ἐπιστάτης, who administered rites for the patron goddesses: the Museum was literally dedicated to the arts and to learning. Its concentration of scholars and artists in one place meant that there was much opportunity for interaction between disciplines – and for disagreements. Timon of Phlius, a writer of satirical lampoons, drew an amusing analogy between Ptolemy's zoo and his well fed scholars:

πολλοὶ μὲν βόσκονται ἐν Αἰγύπτωι πολυφύλωι
βιβλιακοὶ χαρακῖται ἀπείριτα δηριόωντες
Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρωι.

(*SH* 786)

Lots of pedantic cloisterlings are kept in multiracial Egypt, squabbling incessantly in the Muses' birdcage.

The scholars who flocked to enjoy Ptolemaic patronage needed texts from which to work. To facilitate their studies a Library was set up at the same time as the Museum. (Again Aristotle's influence is likely: he is said to have been the first serious manuscript collector.[6]) The list of

[6] Strabo 13.1.54.

Chief Librarians during the third and second centuries, many of whom were tutors to successive crown princes, includes some of the most famous names in Hellenistic scholarship: Zenodotus, Apollonius of Rhodes, Eratosthenes (mathematician and poet), Aristophanes of Byzantium, Apollonius Εἰδογράφος ('Classifier'), Aristarchus (p. 10). Under their direction the Library staff attempted to collect and classify the whole of Greek literature; Callimachus, who probably never became Chief Librarian, compiled the Πίνακες, a 120-volume catalogue (p. 83). A small army of scribes must have been employed in copying papyrus rolls of works commonly consulted; and other members of staff were sent out to mainland Greece in search of rare works. Euergetes went to even greater lengths. He ordered that all books found on board ships which docked at Alexandria should be seized and copied; and he borrowed from Athens for a deposit of 15 talents the official performance texts of the three tragedians; then he kept the originals, sent back copies, and forfeited his deposit.[7] Philadelphus is said to have commissioned the κοινή translation of the Hebrew bible from 72 Palestinian Jews, who completed it in 72 days (hence the title Septuagint). The total holdings amounted to perhaps half a million papyrus rolls. A large proportion of the books were burnt in 48 B.C., when Julius Caesar was besieged at Alexandria. In that fire many obscure works of earlier Greek literature were lost for ever.

The city long continued as a centre of learning, and the techniques of painstaking study and exegesis pioneered there were disseminated throughout the civilized world. Modern Classical scholarship in these fields is part of an unbroken tradition which had its origins in the work of Alexandrian scholars.

3. HELLENISTIC POETRY[8]

i. Problems

Insuperable difficulties face the would-be historian of Hellenistic poetry. In the first place, except for the plays of Menander almost nothing survives from the century preceding the generation of Lycophron, Aratus and Callimachus: we have very little idea how non-dramatic poetry developed during those years, and it follows that we

[7] These two stories are told by Galen: see Fraser II 480–1 n. 147.

[8] See G. O. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic poetry* (Oxford, 1988) 1–25.

cannot adequately assess the originality of the third-century works which do survive. In the second place, both absolute and relative chronologies even for the works of major poets are extremely uncertain. Callimachus, Apollonius and Theocritus in particular frequently allude to each other's work; but who alludes to whom in any given case it is usually impossible to decide. This problem is compounded by the fact that long poems such as the *Aetia* and *Argonautica* were probably recited as 'work in progress' over many years before their final publication; this makes it quite likely that poets reacted to each other's works actually during the process of composition. Thus even when it can be proved that one passage antedates another (and such 'proofs' are rarely convincing), the fact is of very limited use in establishing an absolute chronology. Moreover, several of the Hellenistic poets cannot be dated even to within 50 years. In the third place, only a small fraction of the poetry written during this period survives. Most of what does survive is broadly in line with the aesthetic principles often called 'Callimachean' – so called not because Callimachus originated them, but because he was their most outspoken advocate (see *1–40* nn.). But the existence today of so many poems written according to 'Callimachean' artistic criteria may well not be a true reflection of the popularity of those criteria at the time. It seems quite likely that for every 'Callimachean' poem to have survived a hundred more traditional ones are lost: we have scant fragments or mere titles of many such poems, and their number is increasing as new papyri come to light. This is not to say that the new poets were less significant in their own time than they appear to us with historical hindsight; but clearly their criteria did not command anything like universal support.

In other words, a literary history of the Hellenistic period cannot be written. All we can do is to consider the works which survive and describe some of the broad characteristics which most of them appear to share – always bearing in mind that our sample is probably unrepresentative. On the whole such generalizations are of limited value. It seems that the only characteristic shared by every poem in this volume is that each is striving in its own way to be different.

ii. Poetry and learning

Hellenistic poetry is often characterized as learned and allusive – as if

the earlier epic, lyric, tragic and comic poets were not constantly indulging in puns and etymological play; as if they too were not preoccupied with roots, causes, origins and aetiologies. Every ode of Pindar, every play of Euripides bears witness to the fact that Hellenistic poets were not the first to display wide knowledge of myth or to exploit the possibilities of word-play. Nevertheless, there is a palpable difference in emphasis between the 'learned' details of earlier poetry and the learned nature of many Hellenistic texts. That difference could be said to lie in the degree of self-consciousness, cleverness, subtlety or 'wit' which Hellenistic poems display in their learning. It is tempting to go further and to suggest that 'self-consciousness' is a prime characteristic of many Hellenistic poems, which by alluding to and echoing earlier writers seek to draw attention to their own place in the poetic tradition, to point their similarities to and differences from past literature. Appreciation of this poetry requires an alert and learned reader: alert enough to spot an allusion, learned enough to remember details of a passage to which allusion is made. Allusion can consist in a single word or in the construction of a whole work. Callimachus wrote his *Hecale* (p. 84) for an audience familiar with the Eumaeus episode in *Odyssey* 15; appreciation of Theocritus' *Cyclops* (*493–573*) depends in part on our remembering the words of *Odyssey* 9 and of a dithyramb by Philoxenus; when Jason and Medea finally meet as lovers (*Argonautica* 3.948 ff.) we must recognize allusions to Homeric encounters in battle; the reader of Moschus' *Europa* (*1045–1210*) must know his Aeschylus, Homeric Hymns, Apollonius and Theocritus (see p. 200–1). These are texts to be read through other texts; learning and allusion are absolutely integral to their meaning.[9]

Even in the poor state of our knowledge about the Hellenistic poets' predecessors we can see that poetry of this learned and allusive nature did not appear fully formed in the early third century. It is clear, for example, that Antimachus of Colophon (born c. 440) anticipated many of the characteristics of Hellenistic poetry. His most controversial work was the *Lyde*, a long elegiac poem which dealt with heroes and heroines disappointed in love; the ostensible reason for its composition was the poet's loss of his own mistress, Lyde. Antimachus was a scholar as well as a poet: he produced an edition of Homer often referred to by textual critics in following centuries. The results of these philological inquiries

[9] This aspect, too, is not in itself novel: cf., for example, Euripides' pointed allusions to the *Choephori* in his *Electra*.

can be seen in his use of rare Homeric 'glosses', or words of debated meaning, in his poetry; in addition he used rare words and neologisms, and was notorious for his obscurity. These characteristics point to a linguistic self-consciousness akin to that of Hellenistic poets, some of whom (not Callimachus: see p. 93) we know admired the *Lyde*.

Of Antimachus' work only the most meagre fragments survive,[10] and it is not possible to say how he made use of allusion on a wider, non-verbal level. Nor can we be sure of the extent of his influence on fourth-century poetry; certainly no evidence survives of other authors immediately following his lead. The next scholar-poet of whom we know is Philetas of Cos (born c. 320). Philetas was described by Strabo (14.2.19) as ποιητὴς ἅμα καὶ κριτικός; and, like Antimachus, he combined these two aspects in learned poetry.[11] He wrote a prose treatise called Ἄτακτοι γλῶσσαι, 'Miscellaneous Glosses', explaining rare Homeric and dialectal words, which became a standard reference work. It is possible that he was the first poet to concentrate on small-scale verse (e.g. the famous elegiac *Demeter*) as opposed to long epics. Callimachus pays tribute to him,[12] and Theocritus is said to have been his pupil. Propertius and Ovid allude to him as their inspiration for love-poetry, and to his mistress Bittis, whom he celebrated in elegies and epigrams. He is said to have been so slender (λεπτός – cf. p. 90) that he had to wear lead in his boots to prevent himself being blown away in strong winds.

It seems, then, that Philetas was a pioneer of the 'Hellenistic' approach to poetry. Ptolemy Soter had appointed him tutor to his young son (the future Philadelphus), who was born on Cos; and it is likely that Philetas followed his employer to Alexandria. He was succeeded as royal tutor by one of his own pupils, Zenodotus. In 284 Zenodotus was made first head of the newly established Library. Although he too was a writer of poetry, he was known in antiquity chiefly as a scholar. He began a systematic examination of the Homeric epics, a διόρθωσις, obelizing with a marginal mark lines which he thought later interpolations; he seems also to have added explanatory notes. It may have been Zenodotus who divided the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* into the 24 books in which they are still printed today. The exact nature of this 'edition' is uncertain; but Zenodotus' critical study of Homer

[10] There is an edition by B. Wyss (Berlin, 1936); later discoveries in *SH* 52–79.

[11] His fragments are collected in *CA* pp. 90–6 and supplemented in *SH* 673–5D. See D. W. T. C. Vessey, *Hermes* 99 (1971) 1–10.

[12] See *9–12* n.

aroused much interest at the time, especially in respect of the controversial obelized lines. Aided by two collaborators he went on to produce texts of Pindar, Hesiod and tragedy; and like Philetas before him he compiled a Homeric glossary, as well as a work entitled Λέξεις ἐθνικαί on foreign words in literary texts. During the next century and a half successive librarians, chief among them Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus, were to continue this tradition of detailed textual and literary study.

This was the atmosphere of critical scholarship which received the third-century men of culture who arrived at Alexandria. The word 'critical' is important here. Works of the past were being read not as formerly for enjoyment or moral improvement alone; rather they were being examined scientifically, explained, discussed, catalogued and classified. The individual word took on a new importance. Little wonder that poets of the Hellenistic period, most of whom were themselves scholars, philologers and grammarians, should include in their work Homeric *hapax legomena* (words occurring only once) and allusions to topically contentious passages; or that, themselves steeped in earlier literature, they should write for an elite of readers equally learned. Of course many aspects of these poets' works can be appreciated and enjoyed without this kind of detailed knowledge; but modern readers, who do not have even Homer by heart, are liable to miss much that is important, and can easily gain a false impression of tone, style and 'literary texture'. One aim of the present commentary is to provide help towards a fuller reading of these difficult and allusive poets.

iii. The nature of Hellenistic poetry

Self-consciousness, learning and allusion have been discussed at some length because they are the aspects of Hellenistic poetry which readers have found most difficult to appreciate. It is not necessary to dwell at equal length on other characteristics, which will become clear from a reading of the texts presented in this volume. They include: great interest in the power of Eros and its workings; choice of unusual subject-matter, or novel aspects of well-known subject-matter; pseudo-naive concentration on smallness, poverty and the Simple Life, paralleled by a concentration on smaller-scale, less 'pretentious' types of poetry; novel fusions of metre, dialect and genre; variety of tone within individual

poems, and variety of metre, dialect and subject within the oeuvres of individual writers.

Literary historians have suggested several possible reasons for the new direction taken by poetry in the Hellenistic period.[13] One alleged reason is concerned with the function of poetry within society. Poetry (including tragedies and comedies) continued to be performed at festivals and competitions throughout the fourth and third centuries, and panegyrics of cities and their founders kept poetry in the public eye; but the decline of real democracy under the Hellenistic monarchies and the development of prose as a medium for communicating much that had formerly been expressed in verse meant that the public role of poetry was far more limited than it had been in the fifth and earlier centuries. Many poets, it has been argued, began to cater instead for an audience of well-read private individuals. To this rarefied urban audience the simple life of rustics and the lower classes appealed because such people were outside their own experience and, paradoxically, 'exotic'.

These and similar arguments could be greatly elaborated, but we should perhaps be wary of explanations couched in such general terms. By ignoring the fact that a thousand and one different motives characterize individual poets and individual readers, and by seeking to accommodate within a single 'spirit of the age' the varied and diverse talents of many writers, such theories are open to a charge of credulous determinism. In the light of the problems described above (p. 6–7) truly circumstantial answers are most unlikely ever to be found.

[13] See, for example, *CHCL* I 543, Pfeiffer, *HCS* 87–8.